arXiv:1604.00870v1 [cs.DS] 4 Apr 2016

Mixing of Permutations by Biased Transposition

Shahrzad Haddadan* Peter Winkler†

Abstract

Markov chains defined on the set of permutations of $1, 2, \ldots, n$ have been studied widely by mathematicians and theoretical computer scientists [4, 1, 7, 15]. We consider chains in which a position $i < n$ is chosen uniformly at random, and then $\sigma(i)$ and $\sigma(i+1)$ are swapped with probability depending on $\sigma(i)$ and $\sigma(i+1)$. Our objective is to identify some conditions that assure rapid mixing.

One case of particular interest is what we call the "gladiator chain," in which each number g is assigned a "strength" s_g and when g and g' are swapped, g comes out on top with probability $s_g/(s_g + s_{g'})$. The stationary probability of this chain is the same as that of the slow-mixing "move ahead one" chain for self-organizing lists, but an open conjecture of Jim Fill's implies that all gladiator chains mix rapidly. Here we obtain some positive partial results by considering cases where the gladiators fall into only a few strength classes.

1 Introduction

For any arbitrary natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define S_n to be the set that contains all the permutations of numbers $1, 2, \ldots n$. A natural Markov chain on S_n is the chain which picks a number $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ uniformly at random and operating on $\sigma \in S_n$, puts $\sigma(i+1)$ ahead of $\sigma(i)$ w.p. $p_{\sigma(i),\sigma(i+1)}$. We call this chain the *adjacent transposition* Markov chain. This Markov chain has been studied widely for various choices of $p_{i,j}$ [4, 3, 7, 2].

In this paper, we consider the total variation mixing time, which is defined as the time it takes until the total variation distance between the distribution of the current state and stationarity is less than ϵ (where ϵ is some fixed convergence factor). For Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$ we denote this time by $t_\epsilon(\mathcal{M})$, or if $\epsilon = 1/4$, simply by $t(\mathcal{M})$.

A special case of the adjacent transposition chain which we call the *gladiator chain* has been introduced by Jim Fill ([3]). Fill was interested in probabilistic analysis of algorithms for *self-organizing lists*

*Department of Computer Science, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire 03755. E-mail: shahrzad@cs.dartmouth.edu

†Department of Mathematics, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire 03755. E-mail: peter.winkler@Dartmouth.edu; research supported by NSF grant DMS-1162172.

(SOLs). Self-organizing lists are data structures that facilitate linear searching in a list of records; the objective of a self-organizing list is to sort the records in non-decreasing order of their access frequencies [17]. Since these frequencies are not known in advance, an SOL algorithm aims to move a particular record ahead in the list when access on that record is requested. There are two widely used SOL algorithms: the *move ahead one* algorithm (MA1) and the *move to front* algorithm (MTF). In MA1, if the current state of the list is $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_n)$ and the ith record is requested for access, it will go ahead in the list only one position and the list will be modified to $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_i, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_n)$. In MTF it will go to the front and the list will be modified to $(x_i, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_n)$. It appears that MA1 should perform better than MTF when the list is almost sorted and worse when the low frequency records are standing in front; however, this has not been analytically studied [18]. Considering the adjacent transposition Markov chain corresponding to MA1, Fill shows ([3]) that there are cases in which the chain is not rapidly mixing. Hence, he poses the question of sampling from the stationary distribution of MA1, and he introduces the gladiator chain which has the same stationarity as MA1 and seems to be rapidly mixing for arbitrary choice of parameters. He makes the following conjecture for mixing time of the adjacent transposition chain in general:

Fill's conjecture ([3]).[1] If the adjacent transposition Markov chain is monotone, then it is rapidly mixing. Monotonicity in this context means: for all i, j satisfying $1 \leq i < j \leq n$: $p_{i,j} \geq 1/2$, and $p_{i,j-1} \leq p_{i,j} \leq p_{i,j+1}$.

Here we provide a brief history of the results on the adjacent transposition Markov chain. All of these chains are monotone and rapidly mixing. Wilson and Benjamini's papers [4, 7] led to Fill's conjecture [3]; Bhakta et al. [2] verified the conjecture in two cases.

1. The simple chain. In the case where $p_{i,j} = 1/2$ for all i and j, the chain will have a simple description: Given a permutation σ, pick two adjacent elements uniformly at random, and flip a fair coin to decide whether to swap them. We call this chain, whose stationary distribution is uniform, the *simple* chain. Ironically, proving precise mixing results for this chain was not simple. Many papers targeted this problem [1, 15] and finally Wilson [4] showed the mixing time for this chain is $\Theta(n^3 \log n)$ (he proved lower and upper bounds within constant factors).

2. The constant-bias chain. After Wilson's paper, Benjamini et al. [7] studied the case where $p_{i,j} = p > 1/2$ for all i and j, and $p_{j,i} = 1-p$. Benjamini et al. [7], reduced this problem to the

[1] Fill considered the spectral gap (another measure of mixing) in his study. Here, we are interested in total variation mixing time which, in this case, is within polynomial factor of the spectral gap.

problem of mixing time of an asymmetric simple exclusion process (ASEP) and showed that this ASEP, and consequently the constant-bias chain, mixes in $\Theta(n^2)$ steps. We will talk more about the exclusion process chain later on in this introduction.

3. "Choose your weapon" and "league hierarchy" chains. The following two special cases were studied by Bhakta et al. [2]: the *choose your weapon chain* where $p_{i,j}$ is only dependent on i, and the *league hierarchy chain* given by a binary tree T with n leaves. Each interior node v of T is labeled with some probability $1/2 \leq q_v \leq 1$, and the leaves are labeled by numbers $1 \dots n$. The probability of putting j ahead of i for $j > i$ is equal to $p_{i,j} = q_{j \wedge i}$ where $j \wedge i$ is the node that is the lowest common ancestor of i and j in T.

As we mentioned before, one interesting instance of the adjacent transposition chain which is monotone is the gladiator chain. Here we study a special case of the gladiator chain where gladiators fall into a few classes according to their strengths. (Definition 2).

The gladiator chain. In this chain each element i can be thought of as a gladiator with strength $s(i)$. Every permutation of numbers $1, 2, \dots n$ can be thought of as a ranking of gladiators. In each step of Markov chains we choose $1 \leq k < n$ uniformly at random, i.e., we choose adjacent gladiators $\sigma(k) = i$ and $\sigma(k+1) = j$. These gladiators will fight over their position in ranking. With probability $p_{j,i} = s(i)/(s(i) + s(j))$, gladiator i will be the winner of the game and will be put i ahead of j in σ if it isn't already. With probability $1-p$, j is put ahead of i.

Corollary 1. *The gladiator chain is rapidly mixing if Fill's conjecture holds.*

Particles and the exclusion process. Let $G = \langle V, E \rangle$ be a graph and consider $m < |V|$ particles on the vertices of G. At each step of the Markov chain we pick a vertex v uniformly at random with probability $1/|V|$ and one of its adjacent vertices, w with probability $1/d(v)$. If there is a particle in one of them and not the other one, we swap the position of the particle with probability p.

If p is constant for any choice of v and w, the chain is called the *exclusion process*. The exclusion process is a well known Markov chain, and because of its applications in statistical physics it has been studied widely ([13, 14]). In fact, a special case of this chain where G is a finite line was studied by Benjamini et al. [7] as mentioned before.

Here, we consider the case where $G = \langle V, E \rangle$ is a finite line and we have $|V|$ particles of different types on the vertices of G and they swap their positions with probabilities dependent on their types (Definition 3). We call this Markov chain a *linear particle system*. To any adjacent transposition Markov

chain, we can associate a linear particle system. We will explain this association in Section 3 and prove that the mixing time for an adjacent transposition chain is only polynomially larger than the mixing time of the corresponding linear particle system.

The simplest interesting case of the linear particle system whose mixing time is not well understood is the one with 3 particle types, where exchange probabilities depend only on the types. We will give a formal definition of the particle system in Section 2 and prove it is rapidly mixing under certain conditions.

Definitions and results are presented in Section 2. Section 3 contains the correspondence between the gladiator chain and the linear particle system. Section 4 contains the main proofs.

2 Definitions and Results

Definition 2. Gladiator chain. (Playing in teams) Consider the Markov chain on state space S_n that has the following properties: The set $[n]$ (i.e. gladiators) can be partitioned into subsets: $T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_k$ (k teams). We have the following strength function: $s : [n] \to \mathbb{R}$, $s(g) = s_j$ iff $g \in T_j$. At each step of Markov chain, we choose $i \in [n-1]$ uniformly at random. Given that we are at state σ, and $\sigma(i) = g, \sigma(i+1) = g'$, we put g ahead of g' with probability $\frac{s(g)}{s(g)+s(g')}$.

This is a reversible Markov chain and the stationary distribution π is

$$\pi(\sigma) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} s(i)^{\sigma(i)}/Z. \tag{1}$$

(Z is a normalizing factor.)

Definition 3. The linear particle system. Assume we have k types of particles and of each type i, we have n_i indistinguishable copies. Let $n = \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i$. Let Ω be the state space containing all the different linear arrangements of these n particles. If the current state of the Markov chain is σ, choose $i \in [1, n-1]$ uniformly at random. Let $\sigma(i)$ be of type t and $\sigma(i+1)$ be of type t'. If $t = t'$ do nothing. Otherwise, put $\sigma(i)$ ahead of $\sigma(i+1)$ w.p. $p_{t,t'}$ and put $\sigma(i+1)$ ahead of $\sigma(i)$ w.p. $1 - p_{t,t'}$.

This chain is also a reversible Markov chain.

Proposition 4. *By regarding gladiators of equal strength as indistinguishable particles, any gladiator becomes a linear particle system.*

Lemma 5. *There is an example of the particle system with* 3 *types of particles and non-monotone swapping probabilities that does not mix fast.*

Definition 6. Consider the gladiator chain. We denote the following special case by $G_q(a, b, c)$.

- The set of gladiators, can be partitioned to 3 nonintersecting teams: Arbelas (team A of a gladiators), Bestiarius (team B of b gladiators), Cestus (team C of c gladiators). Cestus are the strongest gladiators and Arbelas are weakest. [2]
- Gladiators of Arbelas have strength s_A. Gladiators of Bestiarius have strength s_B. Gladiators of Cestus have strength s_C. Furthermore, we have $s_A/s_B = s_B/s_C = q$ where $0 \leq q \leq 1$ is a constant.

The steps of $G_q(a, b, c)$ are as defined in Definition 2.

Definition 7. (Constant ratio three particle system)

Consider the particle system chain. We denote the following special case by $\mathcal{EX}_q(a, b, c)$.

- Particles are in 3 types; type 0, type 1 and type 2. We have a indistinguishable copies of particle A, b indistinguishable copies of particle B, c indistinguishable copies of particle C.
- $p_{A,B} = 1 - p_{B,A} = 1/(1+1/q)$, $p_{B,C} = 1 - p_{C,B} = 1/(1+1/q)$ and $p_{A,C} = 1 - p_{C,A} = 1/(1+1/q^2)$. For some constant $0 \leq q \leq 1$.

The steps of $\mathcal{EX}_q(a, b, c)$ are as defined in Definition 3.

Theorem 8. *$\mathcal{EX}_q(a, b, c)$ is rapidly mixing for any choice of a, b, c and $0 \leq q \leq 1/2$.*

We will prove Theorem 8 in Section 4.

Theorem 9. *$G_q(a, b, c)$ is rapidly mixing for any choice of a, b, c and $0 \leq q \leq 1/2$.*

Proof. This is a consequence of Theorem 8 and of Theorem 12, which is stated and proved in the next section. □

Corollary 10. *(Generalization of league hierarchies)*

Let T be tree with n leaves. Each interior nodes v is labeled with some probability $2/3 \leq q_v \leq 1$ and the leaves are labeled by numbers $1 \ldots n$. The probability of putting j ahead of i for $j > i$ is equal to $p_{i,j} = q_{j \wedge i}$ where $j \wedge i$ is the node that is the lowest common ancestor of i and j in T.

[2] Arbelas, Bestiarius and Cestus were three of the many types of gladiators in the Roman Empire.

It is shown in [2] that in the case where T is a binary tree, this mixing problem can be reduced to the simple exclusion process chain. Employing Benjamini's result ([7]), they prove rapid mixing for the binary tree league hierarchies. Theorem 8 can be used to extend the results in [2] to ternary trees.

3 Gladiators and Particles

Consider the gladiator chain $\mathcal{M}$ (Definition 2). At each step of the chain, one of two things is happening:

1. Whisking: gladiators of the same team are fighting.

2. Sifting: gladiators of different teams are fighting.

If we were restricted to whisking steps the chain would be equivalent to the simple chain studied by Wilson. If we were restricted to sifting steps the chain would be the linear particle system chain. In order to study the mixing time of the gladiator chain we analyze sifting and wishing steps separately and then we employ the following decomposition theorem:

Theorem 11. *(Decomposition Theorem) [16]*

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Markov chain on state space Ω partitioned into $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \ldots, \Omega_k$. For each i, let $\mathcal{M}_i$ be the restriction of $\mathcal{M}$ to Ω_i that rejects moves that go outside of Ω. Let $\pi_i(A) = \pi(A \cap \Omega_i)/\pi(\Omega_i)$ for $A \subseteq \Omega$. We define the Markov chain $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ on state space $\{1, \ldots k\}$ as follows: $Pr_{\bar{\mathcal{M}}}(i,j) = \sum_{x \in \Omega_i, y \in \Omega_j} \pi_i(x) Pr_{\mathcal{M}}(x,y)/\pi(\Omega_i)$, where $Pr_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $Pr_{\bar{\mathcal{M}}}$ are transition probabilities of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ respectively.

Then,

$$t(\mathcal{M}) \leq 2t(\bar{\mathcal{M}}) \max_i \{t(\mathcal{M}_i)\}. \tag{2}$$

Theorem 12. *Let τ and τ' be respectively the mixing time for a linear particle system and its corresponding gladiator chain. Then*

$$\tau' \leq \mathcal{O}(n^2)\tau. \tag{3}$$

We use conductance to prove Theorem 12.

Theorem 13. *(Conductance)[12]*

For any Markov chain, define conductance Φ by:

$$\Phi = \min_{\substack{S \in \Omega \\ \pi(S) \leq 1/2}} \left(\sum_{s \in S s' \in S^c} \pi(s) Pr(s,s') \right) / \pi(S).$$

Then, for arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$

$$\left(\frac{1}{\Phi} - 1/2\right)\log\left(\frac{1}{2\epsilon}\right) \leq \ \tau_\epsilon(\mathcal{M}) \ \leq \frac{1}{2\Phi}\log\left(\frac{1}{\pi_{\min}\epsilon}\right). \tag{4}$$

Proof. Let G be a gladiator chain and $\mathcal{M}$ its corresponding particle system with $\mathcal{K}_i$ copies of particle i and k different particles. Take $\sigma_1 \in S_{\mathcal{K}_1}, \sigma_2 \in S_{\mathcal{K}_2}, \ldots, \sigma_k \in S_{\mathcal{K}_k}$ and let $S_{\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\ldots,\sigma_k} \subseteq S_n$ be the set of all permutations in S_n in which all the gladiators corresponding to particle i preserve the ordering associated to them by σ_i. Restriction of G to $S_{\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\ldots,\sigma_k}$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{M}$. Considering all the choices of $\sigma_1 \in S_{\mathcal{K}_1}, \sigma_2 \in S_{\mathcal{K}_2}, \ldots, \sigma_k \in S_{\mathcal{K}_k}$, S_n will be partitioned into $\Pi_{i=1}^{k}\mathcal{K}_i!$ copies of $\mathcal{M}$.

Sifting: Let $\bar{G}$ be defined as in Theorem 11; we will show that $\bar{G}$ is rapidly mixing and applying Theorem 11. We show that the conductance of $\bar{G}$ is only polynomially smaller than conductance of the simple chain, which is known to mix in $n^3 \log n$ steps ([4]). For this purpose, it suffices to prove the following claim:

Claim. Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_k$ be arbitrary, and let $S_{i,k} \subseteq S_{\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\ldots,\sigma_k}$ be the set of all arrangements in $S_{\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\ldots,\sigma_k}$ such that the ith and $i+1$th copy of particle k are adjacent and $\bar{S}_{i,k} = S_{\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\ldots,\sigma_k} \setminus S_{i,k}$. We have $\pi_{\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\ldots,\sigma_k}(S_{i,k}) \geq 1/(n^2+1)$, $\pi_{\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\ldots,\sigma_k}$ being the stationary distribution of G restricted to $S_{\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\ldots,\sigma_k}$, i.e., the stationary distribution of $\mathcal{M}$.

Proof of claim. To each $\sigma \in \bar{S}_{i,p}$, we correspond $\tau \in S_{i,p}$ such that $\pi(\sigma) \geq \pi(\tau)$. Consider τ_1 and τ_2 as follows: Let τ_1 be the arrangement that we get by taking the ith copy of particle p down until it is adjacent to the $i+1$st copy and τ_2 the arrangement that we get by taking the $i+1$st copy of particle p up until it is adjacent to the ith copy. By the detailed balance equation[3], we have $\pi(\tau_1)/\pi(\sigma) = \pi(\sigma)/\pi(\tau_2)$. Hence one of τ_1 or τ_2 will have a larger density of π than σ.

The mapping that we just described sends at most n^2 elements of $\bar{S}_{i,k}$ to $S_{i,k}$. Therefore, $\pi(S_{i,k}) \geq 1/(n^2+1)$.

□

□

4 Constant Ratio Three Particle System

In this section, we prove Theorem 8 and Lemma 5. We use the path congestion method and comparison method to prove upper bounds and conductance to prove lower bounds. Before we proceed to our proof we introduce some terminology.

[3]Detailed balance equation: $\pi(x)p_{x,y} = \pi(y)p_{y,x}$

For arbitrary nonnegative natural numbers a, b, c satisfying $a+b+c = n$, consider the set containing all different arrangements of a copies of particle A, b copies of particle B and c copies of particle C. Let this set be $\Omega_{a,b,c}$. We have, $|\Omega_{a,b,c}| = \binom{a+b}{a\,b\,c} \leq \binom{n}{\frac{n}{3}\,\frac{n}{3}\,\frac{n}{3}}$. We denote the strength of particle A by s_A, the strength of particle B by s_B, and the strength of particle C by s_C. Consider an arbitrary arrangement $\sigma \in \Omega_{a,b,c}$. By $\sigma(i) = A$, we mean a copy particle A is presented at index i of the arrangement σ. The probability of σ in stationarity is

$$\pi(\sigma) = w(\sigma)/\mathcal{Z}_{a,b,c}\ , \tag{5}$$

where $w(\sigma)$ is the weight of σ and is equal to $\Pi_{i=1}^{n} s^i_{\sigma(i)}$, and for arbitrary nonnegative natural numbers a, b, c $\mathcal{Z}_{a,b,c}$ is called the *partition function* and it is equal to

$$\mathcal{Z}_{a,b,c} = \sum_{\sigma \in \Omega_{a,b,c}} w(\sigma). \tag{6}$$

By $w^j(\sigma)$ we mean $\Pi_{i=1}^{n} s^{j+i}_{\sigma(i)}$. Consequently, $\mathcal{Z}^i_{a,b,c} = \sum_{\sigma \in \Omega_{x,y,z}} w^i(\sigma)$.

For any two arrangements $\sigma, \tau \in \Omega_{a,b,c}$, we denote the ratio of their weights by $q_\tau(\sigma) := \pi(\sigma)/\pi(\tau)$ (Equivalently, $q_\tau(\sigma) := w(\sigma)/w(\tau)$). In the case that we are interested in $s_A/s_B = s_B/s_C = q$; hence $q_\tau(\sigma)$ is always some power of q. i.e. $\forall \tau, \sigma \in \Omega_{a,b,c}\ \exists r \in \mathbb{Z}; q_\sigma(\tau) = q^r$. Given arrangement σ, we define $Q(\sigma) := \sum_{\tau \in \Omega_{a,b,c}} q_\sigma(\tau)$. If we restrict this summation to those choices of τ where all copies of particle of type X are fixed, we denote it by $Q_{\bar{X}}(\sigma)$.

When we talk about order of particles we mean sorting by their strengths, i.e. $A < B < C$. We write arrangements of particles either from left to right (meaning $\sigma(1)$ stands leftmost and $\sigma(n)$ stands rightmost) or from down to top (meaning $\sigma(1)$ stands for downmost and $\sigma(n)$ stands for upmost). When we compare particles, by a lower particle we mean lower index in arrangement. By a weaker particle we mean lower in strength.

In an arrangement $\sigma \in \Omega_{a,b,c}$, we specify the ith copy of particle of type A by A_i and $\sigma(i) = A_k$ means at position i of arrangement σ we have the kth copy of type A particles. We denote the position of the ith copy of type A particles by $A_i(\sigma)$. Similar definitions for particles of type B and C holds. The position of the highest copy of particle A below position i is denoted by, $A_{\downarrow i}(\sigma)$. i.e. $A_{\downarrow i}(\sigma) = \max\{k | k < i \text{ and } \sigma(k) = A\}$. Likewise, we define $A_{\uparrow i}(\sigma)$. i.e. $A_{\uparrow i}(\sigma) = \min\{k | k > i \text{ and } \sigma(k) = A\}$. Similar definitions for particles of type B and C holds.

A sub-arrangement of an arrangement σ is denoted by $\sigma[i, j]$ and it is arrangement that takes ith

to jth elements of σ including both ends (note that $\sigma[i,j] \notin \Omega_{a,b,c}$). $\sigma(i,n)$ is the sub-arrangement of σ that starts with i and takes the next n particles; $|\sigma(i,n)| = n$. $\sigma_{-A}[i,j]$ is equal to $\sigma[i,j]$ when we remove all copies of particle A from it. Similar definitions for particles of type B and C holds. Hence, $\sigma[i,j] \in \Omega_{a,b,c} \Rightarrow \sigma_{-A}[i,j] \in \Omega_{0,b,c}, \sigma_{-B}[i,j] \in \Omega_{a,0,c}, \sigma_{-C}[i,j] \in \Omega_{a,b,0}$. $\sigma_{-A}(i,n)$ is equal to $\sigma_{-A}[i,e]$ for some e such that $|\sigma_{-A}[i,e]| = n$. Similar definitions for particles of type B and C holds.

The concatenation of two arrangements σ and τ is denoted by $\sigma|\tau$.

Example 14. Let $\sigma := AABBCABCAABACCB \in \Omega_{6,5,4}$, $\sigma(11) = B_4$, also $\sigma(11) = B$, $B_4(\sigma) = 11$, $B_{\uparrow 4}(\sigma) = 7$, $B_{\downarrow 4}(\sigma) = 3$, $\sigma[4,8] = BCABC$, $\sigma(4,6) = BCABCAAB$. $\sigma_{-A}[4,8] = BCBC$, $\sigma_{-A}(4,6) = BCBCBC$.

The comparison method was introduced by Diaconis and Saloff-Coste [5] and then Randall and Tetali extended it and employed it for analysis of Glauber dynamics [6].

The comparison method is appealing when analyzing Markov chains that make local moves at each step (for instance single site updates in Glauber dynamics). In those cases, a variation of that chain is studied which has the same sample space and stationary distribution, while making a set of moves simultaneously. Then, the mixing times of the two chains are compared (Theorem 15).

Theorem 15. *(Comparison method [6])*

Let $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ be two reversible Markov chains on state space Ω and with stationary distribution π. Let P be the transition matrix of $\mathcal{M}$ and P' the transition matrix of P'. Consider the two underlining graphs of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$, and let them be $G(\mathcal{M})$ and $G(\mathcal{M}')$ respectively. i.e. $G(\mathcal{M}) = \langle \Omega, E(\mathcal{M}) \rangle$ where $E(\mathcal{M}) = \{(\sigma,\tau) | \sigma,\tau \text{ in } \Omega \text{ and } P(\sigma,\tau) > 0\}$, for each $e = (\alpha,\beta) \in E(\mathcal{M})$, we define the capacity of e by $\mathcal{C}(e) = \pi(\alpha)P(\alpha,\beta)$. Similarly, we define $E(\mathcal{M}')$, $G(\mathcal{M}')$ and capacity for $e \in E(\mathcal{M}')$.

For any edge (σ,τ) in $G(\mathcal{M}')$, we find a path in $G(\mathcal{M})$ from σ to τ. Let this path be $\gamma_{\sigma,\tau}$. For an arbitrary edge $e \in E(\mathcal{M})$, let $\Gamma(e) = \{\gamma_{\sigma,\tau} | \gamma_{\sigma,\tau} \text{ traverses through } e\}$ and $\pi_{min} = \min_{\zeta \in \Omega}\{\pi(\zeta)\}$. We define,

$$\mathcal{A}_e = \frac{\sum_{\Gamma(e)} |\gamma_{\sigma,\tau}| \mathcal{C}((\sigma,\tau))}{\mathcal{C}(e)} \tag{7}$$

We have,

$$t_\epsilon(\mathcal{M}) \leq \frac{4\log(1/\epsilon\pi_{min})}{\log(\epsilon/2)} t_\epsilon(\mathcal{M}') \max_{e \in E(\mathcal{M})} \mathcal{A}_e. \tag{8}$$

Here, we study the following variation of $\mathcal{EX}(a,b,c)$ and we denote it by $\mathcal{EX}_t(a,b,c)$.

Definition 16. Let $\mathcal{EX}_t(a,b,c)$ be a Markov chain on state space $\Omega_{a,b,c}$ and $n = a+b+c$. If the current state is σ we choose natural numbers $1 \leq i < j \leq n-1$ uniformly at random and swap them following these rules:

1. If $\sigma(i) = \sigma(j)$, do nothing.
2. If $\sigma(i) = A$ and in $\sigma(j) = C$ or vise versa and $\sigma(i{+}1) = \cdots = \sigma(j{-}1) = 1$. Then, put them in increasing order w.p. $q^{2(j-i)}/(1+q^{2(j-i)})$. With probability $1/(1+q^{2(j-i)})$, do nothing.
3. If $\sigma(i) = \sigma(i{+}1) = \cdots = \sigma(j{-}1) = B$ and $\sigma(j) = C$ or A or If $\sigma(j) = \sigma(j{-}1) = \cdots = \sigma(i{+}1) = B$ and $\sigma(i) = C$ or A. Then, put them in increasing order w.p. $1/(1+q^{j-i})$. With probability $q^{j-i}/(1+q^{j-i})$, do nothing.

The following picture depicts moves number 2 and 3. Later in this text we will refer to these moves by their numbers:

move 2:

C		A
B		B
B		B
.	$\leftrightarrow$	.
.		.
.		.
B		B
A		C

move 3:

B		A		B		C
B		B		B		B
B		B		B		B
.	$\leftrightarrow$	.		.	$\leftrightarrow$	.
.		.		.		.
.		.		.		.
B		B		B		B
A		B		C		B

It can be easily checked that $\mathcal{EX}_t$ is reversible and its stationary distribution is the π in Equation 5.

Theorem 17. *$\mathcal{EX}_t(a,b,c)$ is rapidly mixing.*

We use the path congestion method (Also known as canonical paths method) in our proof. The method is one of the broad approaches usually used to solve mixing problems ([10, 9]). It was first introduced and employed by Jerrum and Sinclair to show the mixing time of a Markov chain which approximates the permanent of a matrix ([8]).

Proof. For any two arbitrary states $\sigma, \tau \in \Omega$, we introduce a path $\gamma_{\sigma,\tau}$. Then, we employ Theorem 18 to show that $\mathcal{EX}_t$ is rapidly mixing.

Theorem 18. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Markov chain with stationary distribution π and E the set of the edges in its underlying graph. For any two states σ and τ in the state space Ω we define a path $\gamma_{\sigma,\tau}$. The congestion factor for any edge $e \in E$ is denoted by Φ_e and is defined by*

$$\Phi_e = \frac{1}{Q(e)} \sum_{\substack{x,y \\ e \in \gamma_{x,y}}} \pi(x)\pi(y). \tag{9}$$

We can bound the mixing time of $\mathcal{M}$ using congestion factor:

$$t_\epsilon(\mathcal{M}) \leq 8\Phi^2(\ln \pi_{min}^{-1} + \ln \epsilon) \tag{10}$$

Where $\Phi = \max_{e \in E} \phi_e$, $\pi_{min} = \min_{x \in \Omega} \pi(x)$ and ϵ is the convergence factor.

Consider arbitrary $\sigma, \tau \in \Omega_{a,b,c}$. Let $n = a + b + c$, we choose the following path from σ to τ:
Starting from σ, repeat the following steps until τ is reached.
Initially, let $i, j = 1$.

1. Let $k = B_j(\tau)$. We define the j th *block* of σ and τ to be the substring starting from i and ending in k. Note that in τ, each blocks starts right after a B and ends with a B. In the jth iteration, the goal is to change $\sigma[i, k]$ until $\sigma[1, k] = \tau[1, k]$, i.e. the first j blocks equal in σ and τ.

2. Using move 2, and starting from the lowest index i, we bring particles C or A down until the $k - i$ A and C particles have the same order in σ and τ.

3. We use move 3 and bring the jth B in σ to $B_j(\tau)$. In this process, we may need to bring several copies of particle B out of the jth block in σ. In that case, we choose a random ordering of Bs and move them with respect to that order. (Details explained in the proof.)

4. Let $i = B_j(\tau) + 1$.

5. j++.

We claim that using these paths the congestion factor for every edge in $\mathcal{EX}_t$ is polynomial.

There are two types of edges: those that make move 2 and those that make move 3. We show that neither of these edges are congested by a factor of more than a polynomial function of n.



Figure 1: Caption

Consider an edge that makes move 2. Let this edge be connecting two states α and β where α and β only differ in a transposition of type move 2. Assume the swapping C and A are the lth C and mth A and $C_l(\alpha) < A_m(\alpha)$.

Let's say $e = (\alpha, \beta)$ is on the path connecting σ to τ. i.e. $(\alpha, \beta) \in \gamma_{\sigma,\tau}$. It follows from the way we set the paths that, for some $j, A_m(\alpha) \leq j < A_{\uparrow A_m \alpha}(\alpha),\ A_m(\sigma) = j$ and for some $i, A_{\downarrow A_m(\beta)}(\beta) < i \leq A_m(\beta),\ A_m(\tau) = i$. We have, $\alpha[1, i-1] = \tau[1, i-1]$ and $\alpha[j+1, n] = \sigma[j+1, n]$. Let's say the number of Bs in $\sigma[0, i]$ is o i.e. $\sigma[0, i] \in \Omega_{m,o,l}$. There are no As in $\alpha[i, j]$, hence we assume it is in $\Omega_{0,x,y}$.

We will try to find an upper bound for the congestion factor of the edge $e = (\alpha, \beta)$. Let $g = A_m(\alpha) - C_l(\alpha)$.

$$\Phi_e = \left(1 + q^{2(g)}\right) \left(\sum_{\substack{\sigma; \\ \alpha[j+1,n]=\sigma[j+1,n]}} \frac{\pi(\sigma)}{\pi(\alpha)} \sum_{\substack{\tau; \\ \alpha[1,i-1]=\tau[1,i-1]}} \frac{\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\alpha)} \right) \pi(\alpha). \tag{11}$$

To make the analysis easier we divide each arrangement to 3 segments; the first segment $[1, i]$, the second $[i, j]$ and the third $[j, n]$. Let $M_t(\alpha)$ be an arrangement that you get from replacing the lowest t particles of type$C$ with particles of type A in $\alpha[i, j]$.

Note that,

$$\frac{\pi(\sigma)}{\pi(\alpha)} = \frac{w(\sigma[1,i])w^i(\sigma[i,j])w^j(\sigma[j,n])}{w(\alpha[1,i])w^i(\alpha[i,j])w^j(\alpha[i,j])} = \frac{w(\sigma[1,i])w^i(\sigma[i,j])}{w(\alpha[1,i])w^i(\alpha[i,j])} \tag{12}$$

Let $\mathcal{S}_t$ be the set of all σs of the above form for which we have t 0s in $\sigma[i, j]$ and therefore $m + t$ 2s and $l-t$ 0s in $\sigma[1, i]$ and remember that the positions of 1s in $\sigma[i, j]$ and $\alpha[i, j]$ are the same. We have,

$$\sum_{\sigma \in S_t} \frac{w(\sigma[1,i])}{w(\alpha[1,i])} = \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{m+t,o,l-t}}{w(\alpha[1,i])}. \tag{13}$$

And,

$$\sum_{\sigma \in S_t} \frac{w(\sigma[i,j])}{w(\alpha[i,j])} = \frac{w^i(M_t)Q^i_{\bar{1}}(M_t(\alpha))}{w(\alpha[i,j])}. \tag{14}$$

In addition,

$$\sum_{\substack{\tau; \\ \alpha[1,i-1]=\tau[1,i-1]}} \frac{\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\alpha)} = \frac{\mathcal{Z}^i_{a-m,b-o,c-l}}{w^i(\alpha[i,n])} \tag{15}$$

Putting all of these together, we will have

$$\Phi_e = \left(1+q^{2g}\right)\left(\frac{w(\alpha)}{w(\alpha[1,j])w^i(\alpha[i,n])}\right)\left(\frac{\mathcal{Z}^i_{a-m,b-o,c-l}}{\mathcal{Z}_{a,b,c}}\right)\sum_t \mathcal{Z}_{m+t,o,l-t}(w^i(M_t)Q^i_{\bar{1}}(M_t)). \tag{16}$$

Note that $1+q^{2g} \leq 2$, $\frac{w(\alpha)}{w(\alpha[1,j])w(\alpha[i,n])^i} = \frac{1}{w(\alpha[i,j])^i}$, $\alpha[i,j] = M_0(\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{Z}_{a,b,c} < \mathcal{Z}^i_{a-m,b-o,c-l}\mathcal{Z}_{m,o,l}$. Hence, if we only restrict the summation over all t to the case where $t = 0$ we can see that Equation 16 is clearly less than or equal to 2. We show in a lemma that if we take the sum over all values of t, Equation 16 only goes up at most to a polynomial.

Lemma 19. *For any arbitrary t,*

$$w(M_t)Q_{\bar{1}}(M_t) \leq q^{t(t+1)-2t}w(\alpha[i,j]). \tag{17}$$

and

$$\mathcal{Z}_{m+t,o,l-t} \leq nq^{-ot}\mathcal{Z}_{m,o,l}. \tag{18}$$

Proof. (of Lemma 19)

Using the following observations will give us the proof: We define $M_{x,y,z} := 0^x1^y2^z$. Clearly, $M_{x,y,z}$ has the maximum probability in $\Omega_{x,y,,z}$ and $\mathcal{Z}_{x,y,z} \simeq w(M_{x,y,x})Q(M_{x,y,z})$. For notation simplicity we use $Q(M_{x,y,z})$ and $Q_{x,y,z}$, and also $q_{M_{x,y,z}}(\sigma)$ and $q(\sigma)$ interchangeably.

Let $\binom{x+y}{y}_q$ be the q-binomial which is the generating function of number of integer partitions that fit into a rectangle of width x and length y. Note that $Q_{x,y,0} = Q_{0,y,x} = \binom{x+y}{y}_q$ (See Figure 4). We also have $Q_{x,0,y} = \binom{x+y}{y}_{q^2}$.

The following equations involving q-binomials are shown in appendix:


σ α β τ
$: \#As \text{ in } \sigma[i,j] = 0$
$A_m(\tau) = j$
$\#As \text{ in } \sigma[i,j] =?$
$l\text{th } C$
$m\text{th } A$
C, B
$A_m(\tau) = i$
$: \#As \text{ in } \sigma[i,j] = 3$
$M_3(\alpha) :$

Figure 2: The congestion factor of move 2 in polynomial.

$$q^2 < q \Rightarrow \binom{x+y}{y}_{q^2} < \binom{x+y}{y}_q. \tag{19}$$

$$q < 1/2 \Rightarrow \binom{x+y}{y}_q = \binom{x+y}{x}_q < 2^x \leq q^{-x}. \tag{20}$$

To verify Equation 17, note that $Q_{\bar{1}}(M_t) \leq \binom{y}{t}_{q^2} \leq q^{-2t}$ and $w(M_t)/w(\alpha[i,j]) \leq q^{t(t+1)}$. Hence, we have Equation 17.

To prove Equation 18 we show that $Q_{x,y,z+t} \leq nQ_{x,y,z}$ where $n = x+y+z$. Let σC^t be the concatenation of t copies of C to left of σ and let $\sigma\uparrow$ be an arrangement that you get from bringing $C_z(\sigma)$ up to the nth position. Hence for $\sigma = CBBCAAB$, and $t = 3$, $\sigma C^t = CBBCAABCCC$ and $\sigma\uparrow = CBBAABC$.

$$Q_{x,y,z+t} = \sum_i \sum_{\substack{\sigma\in\Omega_{x,y,z};\\ C_z(\sigma)=i+1}} q(\sigma[1,i])Q(\sigma[i+1,n]C^t) \leq \sum_i \sum_{\substack{\sigma\in\Omega_{x,y,z};\\ C_z(\sigma)=i+1}} q(\sigma)\binom{i+t}{i}_q$$

$$= \sum_i \sum_{\substack{\sigma\in\Omega_{x,y,z};\\ C_z(\sigma)=i+1}} q^i q(\sigma\uparrow)\binom{i+t}{i}_q \leq n \sum_i \sum_{\substack{\sigma\in\Omega_{x,y,z};\\ C_z(\sigma)=n}} q(\sigma) \leq n\ Q_{x,y,z}.$$

Clearly, $Q_{x-t,y,z+t} \leq Q_{x,y,z+t}$, and $Q_{x-t,y,z+t} \leq Q_{x,y,z+t} \leq n\ Q_{x,y,z}$.

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Z}_{m-t,o,l+t} &= w(M_{m-t,o,l+t})Q(M_{m-t,o,l+t}) \\
&\leq n\ w(M_{m-t,o,l+t})Q(M_{m,o,l}) \\
&\leq n\ \tfrac{w(M_{m-t,o,l+t})}{w(M_{m,o,l})} w(M_{m,o,l})Q(M_{m,o,l}) \\
&\leq n\ q^{-ot}\mathcal{Z}_{m,o,l}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

We can now get back to Equation 16 and bound Φ_e.

$$\Phi_e = \left(1+q^{2g}\right)\left(\frac{\mathcal{Z}^i_{a-m,b-o,c-l}}{\mathcal{Z}_{a,b,c}}\right)\sum_t \mathcal{Z}_{m+t,o,l-t}\left(\frac{w(M_t)}{w(\alpha[i,j])}Q_{\bar{1}}(M_t)\right)^i \tag{21}$$

$$\leq \left(1+q^{2g}\right)\left(\frac{\mathcal{Z}^i_{a-m,b-o,c-l}}{\mathcal{Z}_{a,b,c}}\mathcal{Z}_{m,o,l}\right)\sum_t n(q^{2it+it(t+1)-(2t+ot)}). \tag{22}$$

We know $2i + it + 1 > 2 + o$. Hence, $\Phi_e \leq 2n^2$.

Note. If $C_l(\alpha) > A_m(\alpha)$, we can similarly show that the congestion factor is less than $2n^2$.



Figure 3: Correspondence of partition functions with q-binomials: There are three integer partitions of 9 that fit into a 3×4 rectangle, and there are two arrangements of gladiators in $\Omega_{0,3,4}$ with $q(\tau_1) = q(\tau_2) = q(\tau_3) = q^9$. i.e. the coefficient for q^9 in $Q_{0,3,4}$ equals 3.

So far, we showed that any move 2 edge is only congested by a factor of a polynomial function of n. Consider an edge corresponding to move 3, namely e. We denote this edge by $e = (\alpha, \beta)$ where α and β are the same except from a B and A between which we have all Bs are swapped (Or a B and C between which we have all Bs).

Consider a state σ that used e to get to τ, and let's say we traversed e while fixing block $[i, j]$, and we had As and Cs in the block fixed and bringing the kth B to its position in τ.

Before we proceed to the proof there is a subtlety about using move 3 that needs to be explained. If A_k has to go down to reach its position in τ or if there is only one copy of it in the block there is no complication. Let's assume we have t copies of particle B in $\sigma[i, j]$. All of the t copies of B should move up and stand out of block $\sigma[i, j]$ to reach their position in τ. In order to accomplish this, we choose a subset of $S \subseteq \{1_k, \dots 1_{t+k}\}$ uniformly at random and we move the elements of S in decreasing order of their index out of the block.

Assume, when going from σ to τ we used $e = (\alpha, \beta)$ and in $\alpha[i, j]$ we have t copies of B; $B_k, \dots B_{k+t}$ and the transposition that we are making swaps the $B_{k+l}, B_{k+l+1}, \dots B_{k+d}$ with the next A. We have, $\tau[1, i] = \alpha[1, i]$, $\sigma[j+t, n] = \alpha[j+t, n]$, $\alpha_{-1}[i, j+t] = \tau(i, j)$ (See Figure 4) and $B_{k+i}(\alpha) < B_{l+k}(\alpha) \implies B_{k+i}(\alpha) = B_{k+i}(\sigma)$. There is some information about S that can be determined by examining α and β: $B_{k+d+1}, \dots B_{k+t} \notin S$ but S can contain any of $B_k, \dots B_{k+l}$. Hence, among the random paths connecting σ to τ, there are 2^l subsets that use e and hence the congestion they place on e is $\pi(\tau)\pi(\sigma)/2^{t-l}$.

To bound Φ_e for each e we introduce correspondence $\mathcal{F}_e : \Omega_{a,b,c} \times \Omega_{a,b,c} \to \Omega_{a,b,c}$ which satisfies,

$$\forall \zeta \in \mathcal{F}_e(\Omega_{a,b,c});\ \frac{\sum_{\substack{\sigma,\tau; \\ \mathcal{F}_e^{-1}(\zeta)=(\sigma,\tau)}} \pi(\sigma)\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\alpha)} \leq 2^{t-l}\pi(\zeta); \tag{23}$$

where c is the number of Cs in $\alpha[i, j]$ and $\mathcal{F}_e(\sigma, \tau) \neq \text{NULL} \iff e = (\alpha, \beta) \in \gamma_{\sigma,\tau}$.

Let σ and τ be two ends of a path that traverses e, we define $\mathcal{F}_e$ to be the following:

$$\mathcal{F}_e(\sigma, \tau) := \zeta;\ \zeta[i, n] := \tau[i, n], \zeta[1, i] := \sigma[1, i].$$

Let σ and τ be two ends of e and $\zeta = \mathcal{F}_e(\sigma, \tau)$.

$$\frac{\pi(\sigma)\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\alpha)} = \frac{\pi(\sigma)}{\pi(\alpha)}\frac{\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\alpha)}\pi(\alpha) = q_\alpha(\sigma)q_\alpha(\tau)\pi(\alpha). \tag{24}$$

$$\frac{\pi(\zeta)}{\pi(\alpha)} = \frac{\pi(\zeta[1, i])}{\pi(\alpha[1, i])}\frac{\pi(\zeta[i, j])}{\pi(\alpha[i, j])}\frac{\pi(\zeta[j, n])}{\pi(\alpha[j, n])}. \tag{25}$$



Figure 4: The congestion factor for move 3 is polynomial. τ' is the arrangement that we get when all Bs are out of block $[i, j]$.

$$= \frac{\pi(\sigma[1,i])}{\pi(\alpha[1,i])}\frac{\pi(\tau[i,j])}{\pi(\alpha[i,j])}\frac{\pi(\tau[j,n])}{\pi(\alpha[j,n])} = q_{\sigma'}(\sigma)\ \frac{\pi(\sigma)}{\pi(\alpha)}\frac{\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\alpha)} = q_{\sigma'}(\sigma)q_\alpha(\sigma)q_\alpha(\tau).$$

Where σ' is the following arrangement: $\sigma'[1,i] := \alpha[1,i]$, $\sigma'[i,j] = \sigma[i,j]$, and $\sigma'[j,n] = \alpha[j,n]$, we have $\pi(\sigma')/\pi(\alpha) = \pi(\sigma[i,j])/\pi(\alpha[i,j])$. Hence,

$$\sum_{\sigma,\tau;\mathcal{F}(\sigma,\tau)=\zeta} \frac{\pi(\sigma)\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\alpha)} = \sum_{\substack{\sigma,\tau \\ \mathcal{F}(\sigma,\tau)=\zeta}} q_\alpha(\sigma)q_\alpha(\tau)\pi(\alpha) = \sum_{\substack{\sigma,\tau \\ \mathcal{F}(\sigma,\tau)=\zeta}} q_{\sigma'}(\sigma)\pi(\zeta). \tag{26}$$

Since we have $t-l$ Bs with undecided position between $j-i$ other elements we have, $\sum q_\sigma(\sigma') \leq \binom{j-i+t-l}{t-l}_q$. Using Equations 19 and 20, we have $\sum q_\sigma(\sigma') \leq 2^{t-l}$. Hence, we have Equation 23.

$$\Phi_{e=(\alpha,\beta)} = (1+q^g)\sum_{\substack{\sigma,\tau \\ e\in\gamma_{\sigma,\tau}}} \frac{\pi(\sigma)\pi(\tau)}{\pi(\alpha)2^{t-l}} \leq 1. \tag{27}$$

We showed the for any arbitrary edge e, $\Phi_e \leq \max\{n^2, 1\}$. We also have $\pi_{min} \leq (q^{n(n+1)}/|\ \Omega_{a,b,c}|)$. Now we apply Theorem 18 and we will have,

$$t_\epsilon(\mathcal{EX}_t) \leq 8n^4(n^3 + \ln(\epsilon^{-1})). \tag{28}$$

$$t(\mathcal{EX}_t) \leq 8n^7. \tag{29}$$

□

To show that the exclusion process chain is rapidly mixing we compare it to $\mathcal{EX}_t$.

4.1 Proof of Theorem 8.

We compare $\mathcal{EX}_t$ and $\mathcal{EX}$, using Theorem 15 and knowing $\mathcal{EX}_t$ is rapidly mixing will make the proof complete.

Proof. Consider an edge $e = (\sigma, \tau)$ that makes move 2 in $\mathcal{EX}_t$. Assume e is swapping $\sigma(i) = A$ and $\sigma(i+1+d) = C$ and $\sigma[i+1, i+d] = B^d$. We indicate a swap of elements $\sigma(i)$ and $\sigma(i+1)$ in $\mathcal{EX}$ by t_i or $t_i(p,p')$ if we are swapping particles p and p' and $\sigma(i) = p, \sigma(i+1) = p'$.
Let $\gamma_{\sigma,\tau} := t_i(A,B), t_{i+1}(A,B), \ldots t_{i+d-1}(A,B), t_{i+d}(A,C), t_{i+d-1}(B,C), t_{i+d-2}(B,C) \ldots t_i(B,C)$.

Consider an arbitrary $e = (\alpha, \beta)$ that is making swap $t_i(A,B)$ and $\alpha[i-t, i-1] = 1^t$. If $e \in \gamma_{\sigma,\tau}$ then, $\exists j \in [1,t]; \forall k \neq i, i-j\ \sigma(k) = \alpha(k); \sigma(i-j) = A, \sigma(i) = B$. And τ will be the state that you

reach by swapping $\sigma(i-j) = A$ and $\sigma(i+1+d) = C$. Let e' be the edge in $\mathcal{EX}_t$ that connects σ to τ. We have, $\mathcal{C}(e') = \pi(\sigma)/(1 + 1/q^{2(d+j)})$ and $\pi(\sigma) = \pi(\alpha)1/q^j$.

$$A_e = \frac{\sum_{\Gamma(e)} |\gamma_{\sigma,\tau}|\mathcal{C}(e')}{\mathcal{C}(e)} = \sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{|\gamma_{\sigma,\tau}|1/q^j(1+1/q)}{1+1/q^{2(d+j)}} \leq 2(d+t)\sum_{j=1}^{t} \frac{1/q^j(1+1/q)}{1/q^{2(d+j)}} \tag{30}$$

$$A_e \leq 2(d+t)(1+1/q)q^{2d}\sum_{j=1}^{t} q^j = \frac{2(d+t)(1+1/q)q^{2d}(1-q^{t+1})}{1-q} \tag{31}$$

Hence, $\mathcal{A}_e \leq 2(d+t) \leq n$, where n is the length of the arrangements or total number of particles.

Similarly, we can show that $\forall e \in \mathcal{EX}, \mathcal{A}_e \leq n$. $\pi_{min} \leq (q^{n(n+1)}/2^{3/2n})$. Hence using Theorem 15, Theorem 17 and Theorem 18 we have,

$$t(\mathcal{EX}) \leq n(2n^3)t(\mathcal{EX}_t) \leq 16n^{11}. \tag{32}$$

□

4.2 Proof of Lemma 5

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a particle system of types A, B, C, each type having m copies, $p_{A,B} = p_{B,C} = \frac{1}{1+q} > 1/2$, i.e. $q < 1$ and $p_{A,C} = 1/2$ (The values for m and q will be set later.) We show that the conductance of this chain in small, employing Theorem 13 we conclude

$$t(\mathcal{M}) \geq \left(\frac{1}{4\Phi} - 1/2\right) \geq \mathcal{O}(q^{-2m})$$

Let P be the transition matrix of $\mathcal{M}$. Consider the set $S \subseteq \Omega$ to be the set of all arrangements where all the Cs are above As. The conductance of S is denoted by $\Phi(S)$ which is an upper bound for the conductance of the chain if $\pi(S) \leq 1/2$.

Let $\rho(S) = \{x \in S | \exists y \in \Omega \setminus S; P(x,y) > 0\}$. To each $\sigma \in \rho(S)$, we assign $\sigma' \in S \setminus \rho(S)$ by taking either the topmost A (or the lowermost C in σ) and taking it down (or top) below (or above) the next $m/2$ ones; σ' will be satisfying $\pi(\sigma') = q^{m/2}\pi(\sigma)$. For a particular choice of σ' there are at most $2m$ arrangements which are assigned to it. Hence $\Phi(S) \leq q^{m/2}/2m$. It remains to show $\pi(S) \leq 1/2$.

Since swapping a A and C does not change π we have the following equation in which k shows the position in which we can have the lowest C or topmost A:

$$\pi(S) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{\binom{m+k}{k}_q \binom{2m-k}{m-k}_q}{\binom{2m}{m}_q^2} \leq m\frac{\binom{m+m/2}{k}_q^2}{\binom{2m}{m}_q^2} \leq m\left(\frac{(1-q^{m/2})}{(1-q^{2m})}\right)^{2m} \leq \frac{m}{\left((1+q^{m/2})(1+q^m)\right)^{2m}}$$

Hence for hanging $\pi(S) \leq 1/2$ it suffices to set $q > \left((2m)^{1/2m} - 1\right)^{1/m}$. Note that since $\lim(2m)^{1/2m} = 1$, for any $m > 2$, there is a constant value for $q < 1$ satisfying $q > \left((2m)^{1/2m} - 1\right)^{1/m}$.

□

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Dana Randall for very helpful conversation about the gladiator problem and Fill's conjecture. Also, Sergi Elizalde for his help and knowledge on generating functions.

Appendix

A q-binomials

The Gaussian binomial coefficients or q-binomial coefficients are polynomials defined in analogy to the binomial coefficients. For $r \leq m$ they are defined by:

$$\binom{m}{r}_q = \frac{(1-q^m)(1-q^{m-1})\dots(1-q^{m-r+1})}{(1-q)(1-q^2)\dots(1-q^r)}. \tag{33}$$

The contents of this appendix can be found in Richard Stanley's course: "Topics in Algebraic Combinatorics", Chapter 6 (See [11].)

It is known that the generating function for the number of Young diagrams fitting in an $m \times n$ box or equivalently the number of integer partitions having at most n parts each smaller than m equals $\binom{m}{n}_q$.

Gaussian binomial coefficients have many properties similar to binomial coefficients such as the following:

$$\binom{m}{r}_q = \binom{m}{m-r}_q.$$

$$\binom{m}{r}_q = \binom{m-1}{r}_q + q^{m-r}\binom{m-1}{r-1}_q.$$

Proposition 20. *If $q < 1/2$ we will have,*

$$\begin{aligned}\binom{m}{r}_q &= \frac{(1-q^m)(1-q^{m-1})\ldots(1-q^{m-r+1})}{(1-q)(1-q^2)\ldots(1-q^r)} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{r}(1-q^{m-i+1})/(1-q^i) \\ &< \prod_{i=1}^{r} 1/(1-q) \\ &< 2^r < (\tfrac{1}{q})^r.\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 21. *The q-binomial is always a polynomial of q with positive coefficients. Hence,*

$$q < q' \Rightarrow \binom{m}{r}_q < \binom{m}{r}_{q'}. \tag{34}$$

References

[1] P. Diaconis and M. Shahshahani. *Generating a random permutation with random transpositions.* Probability Theory and Related Fields, 57:159179, 1981.

[2] P. Bhakta, S. Miracle, D. Randall and A. Streib, *Mixing times of Markov chains for self-organized lists and biased permutations.* 25th Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA), 2014

[3] J. Fill. *An interesting spectral gap problem.* Unpublished manuscript, 2003.

[4] D. Wilson, *Mixing times of lozenge tiling and card shuffling Markov chains.* The Annals of Applied Probability, 1:274325, 2004.

[5] P. Diaconis and L. Saloff-Coste, *Comparison techniques for random walks on finite groups.* The Annals of Applied Probability, 21:21312156, 1993.

[6] D. Randall and P. Tetali, *Analyzing glauber dynamics by comparison of Markov chains.* Journal of Mathematical Physics, 41:15981615, 2000.

[7] I. Benjamini, N. Berger, C. Hoffman and E. Mossel. *Mixing times of the biased card shuffling and the asymmetric exclusion process.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc, 2005.

[8] M. Jerrum and A. Sinclair. *Approximating the permanent.* SIAM Journal on Computing, 18 (1989), pp. 1149-1178.

[9] A. Sinclair. *Improved bounds for mixing rates of Markov chains and multicommodity flow*. Combinatorics, Probability and Computing, 1 (1992), pp. 351-370.

[10] M. Mihail and P. Winkler, *On the number of Eulerian orientations of a graph*. Algorithmica 16 (1995), pp. 402-414.

[11] R. P. Stanley, *Topics in Algebraic Combinatorics*. Course notes for Mathematics, (2012) Citeseer. http://www-math.mit.edu/∼rstan/algcomb/algcomb.pdf.

[12] A. Sinclair and M. Jerrum, *Approximate Counting, Uniform Generation, and Rapidly Mixing Markov Chains.* Information and Computation, 82 (1989), Page. 93-133.

[13] R. I. Oliveira. *Mixing of the symmetric exclusion processes in terms of the corresponding single-particle random walk*. Ann. Probab. Volume 41, Number 2 (2013), 871-913.

[14] B. Morris. *The mixing time for simple exclusion*. Ann. Appl. Probab. 16 (2006), no. 2, 615635. 60K35

[15] P. Diaconis and L. Saloff-Coste. *Comparison techniques for random walks on finite groups*. The Annals of Applied Probability, 21:21312156, 1993.

[16] R. Martin and D. Randall. *Disjoint decomposition of Markov chains and sampling circuits in Cayley graphs*. Combinatorics, Probability and Computing 15: 411-448, 2006.

[17] R. Rivest. *On self-organizing sequential search heuristics*. Communications of the ACM 19 (2): 6367, 1976.

[18] J. H. Hester and D. S. Hirschberg. *Self-organizing linear search*. ACM Comp. Surveys 19 295-311, 1985.